

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTES ON *ABIES BRACTEATA*  
AND *PINUS COULTERI*

DAVID D. KECK

One of the publications that has proved to be a continual source of trouble to bibliographers is Aylmer Bourke Lambert's "A Description of the Genus *Pinus*," which appeared in five editions over the period from 1803 to 1842. The confusion aroused by this work has been due not only to the long period of years over which it was published, but also to the fact that copies of the same edition do not always agree in contents and arrangement. These editions have been described in detail by Renkema and Ardagh (2).

Now attention has been called again by Little (1) to certain names of conifers first published on extra pages in the 1832 edition. These names are familiar from later publication in other places. In this 1832 edition, also known as "editio minor," or the third edition, there seem to have been inserted in volume two between pages 144 and 145 such extra pages as the printer and engraver had ready at the time. The copies of this volume differ as to the number of extra pages that are included, which, so far as known, vary from none to a potential twenty. Renkema and Ardagh apparently were acquainted with six or seven copies of this rare edition, and Little examined four more. I have looked at the copy at Stanford University and the one at the University of California, Berkeley, both of which appear to be in original bindings.

This edition is always cited as appearing in 1832, and Little points out that it was available to Lindley before the latter's article on *Abies* appeared in the Penny Cyclopaedia in 1833. The text for the "editio minor" was printed for an imperial octavo, but the plates were of the folio size common to the other four editions. Consequently, some copies appear as folios, with the text sheets pasted on larger pages of folio size, as those at the University of California, the New York Botanical Garden, and Kew, but in other copies, as the ones at Stanford and Arnold Arboretum, the beautiful plates have been either folded in or closely trimmed to fit the large octavo text.

The species of conifers listed by Renkema and Ardagh as occurring on the unnumbered pages between pages 144 and 145 of volume two are *Pinus Gerardiana*, *P. Sabiniana*, *P. monticola*, *P. grandis* (= *Abies grandis*), *P. nobilis* (= *Abies nobilis*), *P. Menziesii* (= *Picea sitchensis*), *P. Douglasii* (= *Pseudotsuga taxifolia*), and *P. dumosa*. All but the first and last of these are conifers of the United States. The other unnumbered pages contain notes on

---

Corrected date line: MADROÑO, Vol. 8, pp. 145-176. January 28, 1946.  
MADROÑO, Vol. 8, pp. 177-208. May 2, 1946.

Australian and New Zealand conifers. Little made no additions to this list from the copies of the 1832 edition that he examined, but two more species are found in both of the California copies. The Stanford copy contains the extra pages for the species mentioned above except *Pinus Gerardiana*, and in addition contains *Pinus Coulteri* and *P. bracteata* (= *Abies bracteata*). The two latter species are also found in the copy at Berkeley, but of the above list it lacks the extra pages for *Pinus dumosa* and *P. Douglasii*. Several species described on the extra pages, including *Pinus Coulteri* and *P. bracteata*, are accompanied by the colored plates used also in the subsequent editions.

Authors have hitherto dated the publication of the Coulter Pine from the following: *Pinus Coulteri* D. Don, Trans. Linn. Soc. 17: 440, 1837, but now it may be given as *Pinus Coulteri* D. Don in Lamb., Descr. Genus Pinus ed. 3 (8°), 2: unnumbered p. betw. pp. 144 and 145, 1832. Fortunately no name change for this tree is involved.

The Santa Lucia Fir, however, must again take the name by which it commonly went prior to 1889 when Sargent called it *Abies venusta* (Dougl.) K. Koch, believing that this specific name, published in 1836, had priority over *Abies bracteata* (D. Don) Nutt., the specific name of which he thought was published in 1837. Little (*l.c.*) showed that both names were known in 1836, but did not decide which one was published earlier. Now the name and synonymy of this tree become as follows:

**ABIES BRACTEATA** (D. Don) Nutt., N. Am. Sylva 3: 137, pl. 118, 1849. *Pinus bracteata* D. Don in Lamb., Descr. Genus Pinus ed. 3 (8°), 2: unnumbered p. betw. pp. 144 and 145, 1832. *Pinus venusta* Dougl., Comp. Bot. Mag. 2: 152, 1836. *Picea bracteata* Loudon, Arb. Frut. Brit. 4: 2348, fig. 2256, 1838. *Abies venusta* K. Koch, Dendrol. 2(2): 210, 1873.

Several additional plates are found between pages 144 and 145 in the Stanford copy that deserve mention. These all occur without accompanying text. As in the case of the other plates in this work, the binomials beneath the plates lack the authority, so one does not know at a glance which names are published for the first time. These plates, some of which have numbers, are: *Abies Smithiana* (usually accredited as *A. Smithiana* Lindl., 1833 = *Picea Morinda* Link, 1841), *Pinus Llaveana* (usually accredited as *P. Llaveana* Schiede, 1838 = *P. cembroides* Zucc., 1832), *Pinus Brutia* (? = *P. bruttia* Tenore, 1826), *Araucaria Cunninghamii* (= *A. Cunninghamii* Sweet, 1830), *Juniperus chinensis* (? = *J. chinensis* L., 1767), *Juniperus excelsa* (not further identified), *Cupressus horizontalis* (= *C. horizontalis* Mill., 1768, which = *C. sempervirens* L., 1753), *Taxus Harringtonia* (usually accredited as *T. Harringtonia* Knight ex Forbes, 1839 = *Cephalotaxus Harringtonia* K. Koch, 1873). The last four of these, viz., *Juniperus chinensis*, *J. excelsa*, *Cupressus horizontalis*, and *Taxus Harringtonia*, do not occur in Renkema and

Ardagh's list of plates for any of the editions of Lambert. I have not had access to the later editions to determine whether these appeared there under other names. Possibly *Abies Smithiana* Lamb., *Pinus Llavecana* Lamb., and *Taxus Harringtonia* Lamb. are properly published in this Stanford copy under article 44 of the International Rules. It is indeed fortunate, however, that no name changing of an established species appears to be involved.

The above plates were of the usual engraved type common to the work. An additional engraved plate of an *Abies* cone-bearing twig without name or number has the name "Pindrow" penciled below it, probably much later. The first regular appearance of a plate of this species in Lambert was in 1837.

Finally, in the Stanford copy also are unlabelled colored drawings readily recognized as *Pinus tuberculata* Gord. not D. Don (two cones on two pages), *P. muricata* D. Don (two cones on one page), and *P. radiata* D. Don (two cones on two pages). These drawings apparently were originals made for the use of the engraver. These species were all legitimately published some years later in various works.

Grateful acknowledgement is made of suggestions received from Mr. Alfred Rehder of the Arnold Arboretum in the preparation of these notes.

Carnegie Institution of Washington,  
Division of Plant Biology,  
Stanford University, California.

#### LITERATURE CITED

1. LITTLE, E. L., JR. Notes on Nomenclature in Pinaceae. *Am. Jour. Bot.* 31: 587-596. 1944.
2. RENKEMA, H. W., and J. ARDAGH. Aylmer Bourke Lambert and his "Description of the Genus Pinus." *Jour. Linn. Soc. Lond., Bot.* 48: 439-466. 1930.

## A NEW NOLINA FROM SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

HOWARD SCOTT GENTRY

While visiting at the San Diego Museum of Natural History during the summer of 1945, my attention was called by the curator, Mrs. E. B. Higgins, to a *Nolina* that she and Mr. Harbison, entomologist of the same institution, had recently discovered near the Dehesa School. This locality is about eight miles east of El Cajon, San Diego County, California, and some fifteen miles north of the Mexican border in the bold, granitic mountains so characteristic of that region. Fire had swept the chaparral one or two years previous to our visit. The *Nolina* grew on the margins of what had been a chaparral slope and showed a marked preference for granitic outcrops and the coarse detrital edges of steep-sided gulleys, indicating that it had not been a close component of